

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 DANA SCOTT KRULEE,
11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 RECEIVABLES PERFORMANCE
14 MANAGEMENT, LLC, et al.,
15 Defendants.

16 Case No. 5:14-cv-02860-RMW

17 **ORDER ON MOTIONS TO SEAL**

18 Re: Dkt. Nos. 50, 68

19 Defendants Receivables Performance Management, LLC (“RPM”) and Jefferson Capital
20 Systems, LLC (“Jefferson Capital”) filed two motions to seal in connection with a motion to
21 compel arbitration. *See* Dkt. Nos. 50, 68 (Motions to seal); Dkt. No. 51 (Motion to compel
22 arbitration). The motions seek to seal in full two Agreements transferring consumer debt from one
23 entity to another. *See* Dkt. No. 50-4 (seeking to seal “Account Purchase Agreement” and
24 “Assignments of Accounts” between CompuCredit and Jefferson Capital) and Dkt. No. 68-1
25 (seeking to seal “Account Ownership Agreement” between First National Bank of Omaha and
26 CompuCredit) (collectively, “Agreements”).

27 Plaintiff opposed both motions to seal, arguing that defendants’ requests were not narrowly
28 tailored, that there were no compelling reasons to seal the Agreements, and because the
Agreements were essential to the motion to compel arbitration. Dkt. Nos. 53, 69. Plaintiff also
argues that he was prejudiced by defendants’ sealing request because he was not able to review

1 unredacted copies of the Agreements. *Id.* However, plaintiff was given the opportunity to enter
2 into a protective order and review unredacted copies of the Agreements but did not do so. Dkt.
3 No. 54-1.

4 Turning to the merits of the sealing motions, the court finds that the defendants' sealing
5 requests are not narrowly tailored. Applying the standards set forth in *Kamakana v. City &*
6 *County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006), defendants' declarations in support of
7 sealing only justify sealing information related to "the pricing and structure for buying open
8 (credit card) accounts." Dkt. No. 68-1 ¶ 3. Accordingly, the court DENIES WITHOUT
9 PREJUDICE the motions to file under seal. Defendants shall file narrowly tailored redactions
10 directed only to "the pricing and structure for buying open (credit card) accounts" within 14 days
11 of this order.

12 In addition, by 5 p.m. on Tuesday May 26, 2015, plaintiff and defendants shall enter into a
13 protective order, allowing plaintiff (or plaintiff's counsel) access to the unredacted Agreements for
14 purposes of this litigation only.¹ Plaintiff shall have 7 days thereafter to submit a letter brief, not
15 to exceed 3 pages, explaining any basis revealed by his review of the Agreements for challenging
16 the power of Jefferson to enforce the arbitration agreement contained in the "Terms and
17 Conditions" relating to the FNBO Emerge Card. *See* Dkt. No. 51-51 at ¶¶ 6-7.

18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19 Dated: May 21, 2015

20 
Ronald M. Whyte
United States District Judge

21
22
23
24
25
26
27 ¹ The court assume that the parties can agree upon the terms of a protective order. If necessary,
28 they can use the Northern District's Model Order if they cannot agree. *See*
<http://www.cand.uscourts.gov/model-protective-orders>.